

## UNITED STATE PARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## **United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

08/905,293

08/01/97

ROSOK

Y

030436.46SU1

023914 HM22/0608
MARLA J MATHIAS
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY
PATENT DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 4000
PRINCETON NJ 08543-4000

DEVILS
ARTUNIT PAPER NUMBER

1645

DATE MAILED:

**EXAMINER** 

06/08/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

## Notification of Non-Compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c)

Application No.

08/905,293

Applicant(s)

Examiner S Devi Ph D

Art Unit

Rosok et al.



The Appeal Brief filed on Mar 13, 2001 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.  To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three TIME PERIODS: (1) ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer: (2) TWO MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeals at (2)	<u> </u>	3. Devi, Fn.D.	1645
1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.  To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three TIME PERIODS: 11 ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) TWO MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.  1. The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.  2. The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).  3. At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).  4. The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).  5. The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).  6. A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and (a) the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.  7. The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).  8. The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).  9. Other lincluding any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained r	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) TWO MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.  1.		for failure to comply with one of	r more provisions of 37 CFR
<ol> <li>The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).</li> <li>At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).</li> <li>The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).</li> <li>The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).</li> <li>A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and</li> <li>the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).</li> <li>The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).</li> <li>Wother (including any explanation in support of the above items):          <ul> <li>Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are</li> </ol>	mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) TWO MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY		
<ul> <li>3.  At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).</li> <li>4.  The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).</li> <li>5.  The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).</li> <li>6.  A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and</li> <li>(a)  the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>(b)  the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>7.  The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).</li> <li>8.  The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).</li> <li>9.  Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.</li> <li>Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>The brief does not contain the items required under or in the proper order.</li> </ol>	37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are	re not under the proper heading
<ul> <li>4.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>The brief does not contain a statement of the status appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).</li> </ol>	of all claims, pending or cancelle	ed, or does not identify the
<ul> <li>The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).</li> <li>A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and</li> <li>(a) the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>(b) the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).</li> <li>The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).</li> <li>Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.</li> <li>Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are</li> </ul>	3.  At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.19).	to the final rejection, and the brie 32(c)(4)).	ef does not contain a statement
<ul> <li>6.  A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and</li> <li>(a) the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>(b) the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>7. The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).</li> <li>8. The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).</li> <li>9. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.</li> <li>Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are</li> </ul>	4.   The brief does not contain a concise explanation of t line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference	he claimed invention, referring to characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5))	o the specification by page and
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>(b) ☐ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.</li> <li>7. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).</li> <li>8. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).</li> <li>9. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.</li> <li>Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are</li> </ul>	5.   The brief does not contain a concise statement of the	e issues presented for review (37	7 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.  (b) the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.  7. The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).  8. The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).  9. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  **Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.  **Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are	6. $\square$ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two	or more claims in this application	n, and
7.  The brief does not present argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).  8.  The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).  9.  Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.  Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are	(a) the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR together, yet presents arguments in support there	1.192(c)(7) that one or more classed in the argument section of the	aims do not stand or fall e brief.
<ul> <li>8.  The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).</li> <li>9.  Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.</li> <li>Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are</li> </ul>	(b) the brief includes the statement required by 37 C together, yet does not present arguments in supp	FR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more or thereof in the argument secti	claims do not stand or fall on of the brief.
9.  Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):  **Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.  **Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are	7.   The brief does not present an argument under a sepa	rate heading for each issue on ap	opeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
Under section IV, the Appeal Brief incorrectly states that the Advisory Action of 10 April 2000 indicated that "all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.  Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are	8.   The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appearance.	ealed claims as an appendix there	eto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
"all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the Advisory Action indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e., those claims that were under examination, remained rejected.  Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are	9. $\boxtimes$ Other (including any explanation in support of the above	ove items):	
Under section VI, the third paragraph does not accurately state the issue. The rejected claims 28-31 are dependent claims. The phrase "as applied to claims" in the statement of rejection is missing.	"all pending claims" remained rejected. However, the	e Advisory Action indicated that	f 10 April 2000 indicated that claims 1-22 and 28-31, i.e.,
	Under section VI, the third paragraph does not a dependent claims. The phrase "as applied to claims	ccurately state the issue. The rej	iected claims 28-31 are is missing.

St Devi Patent Examiner June 01.